DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 255 UD 024 526

TITLE	Briefing Book for Education.
INSTITUTION	National Governors' Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	24 Sep 85
NOTE	61p.
AVAILABLE FROM	N.G.A. Publications, Suite 250, 444 N. Capitol St., NW, Washington, DC 20001 ($7.50).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Facilities; Educational Improvement; Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; Government Role; Postsecondary Education; *School Choice; *State Action; *State School District Relationship; *Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

This document presents briefing papers for the seven gubernatorial task forces proposed in the National Governors' Association Action Plan for Attaining Educational Excellence. An introductory section discusses the complementary responsibilities of Federal, State, and local governments for assuring access to educational opportunities for all students. A conceptual framework is described for addressing reform issues through the strategic use of state powers and authorities to introduce the best elements of a market orientation to the educational enterprise. Such an orientation is intended, it is said, to empower the providers of service (teachers and administrators) to produce a better, more cost effective and responsive product, while, at the same time, empowering the consumers of educational services (parents, students, and taxpayers) to exercise greater choice in the educational product they buy. The task forces, which will be convened to explore options and develop strategies for State action within this framework, are discussed individually in the next seven sections of the briefing book. Six of the areas of reform deal with issues related to elementary-secondary education, and one deals with post-secondary education. The topics discussed are as follows: (2) Expanding Educational Opportunity and Choice; (3) Improving Young People's Readiness for School; (4) Attracting and Retaining Talented Teachers; (5) Encouraging Results Oriented Leadership; (6) Making More Efficient Use of School Buildings; (7) Making Effective Educational Use of Advanced Technology; and (8) College Quality. Each section provides background on the proposed scope of inquiry of each task force, and a discussion of current state practices, relevant research findings, and the state policy issues to be addressed by each task force. The ninth and final section describes proposed task force activities and provides timetables for the entire initiative. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263255

BRIEFING BOOK FOR EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carol Eliason
N.G.A.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HD0n5-26

National Governors' Association
Center for Policy Research

BRIEFING BOOK
FOR
EDUCATION

REVISED
09/24/85

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Section
The Governors' Action Plan for Attaining Educational Excellence	1
Expanding Educational Opportunity and Choice	2
Improving Young Peoples' Readiness for School	3
Attracting and Retaining Talented Teachers	4
Encouraging Results Oriented Leadership	5
Making More Efficient Use of School Building	6
Making Effective Educational Use of Advanced Technology	7
College Quality	8
The Governors' Action Plan to Attain Educational Excellence	9

THE GOVERNORS' ACTION PLAN FOR ATTAINING EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

NGA policy in education recognizes that states have the constitutional responsibility to educate their citizens. State financing accounts for as much as half of all public sector resources devoted to education. States play a major role in the governance of education by assuring the citizenry of the quality of educational services as part of their consumer protection responsibilities, by monitoring educational institutions, licensure of teachers and granting educational credit to individual students. In many cases, governors, as chief executives of the states, have powers of appointment over educational governance structures and provide policy leadership and incentives to promote educational reform.

For the most part, however, states do not deliver educational services. Within states it is the locally governed elementary and secondary school system, financed primarily with state and local funds, that is charged with ensuring that all young people achieve a basic level of competence in the citizenship, literacy, communication and computational skills needed for adult life. A variety of state and local educational institutions complement and enhance such basic education at the post-secondary level through research and development activities, advanced studies and programs that help prepare individuals for the work force. The finance of such post-secondary programs is shared between the student and the states, supplemented by federal support in the form of student aid.

The federal government shares interest in and responsibility for education with state and local government to assure access to educational opportunities for all students, regardless of family income, race, sex, national origin or handicapping condition through the provision of additional services to students who are at risk within traditional educational programs, supporting research and development and providing special programs for preparing the workforce in fields of national interest. In addressing these areas of shared concern, complementary efforts on the part of all levels of government are needed. Such efforts should be structured to provide sufficient flexibility in program design needed at the local level to allow room for teacher creativity and to adequately respond to diverse circumstances. The challenge ahead is to promote such flexibility while adhering to firm standards of accountability regarding attainment of the student outcomes sought.

It is recognized that states have taken the leadership role in addressing health care financing issues through the introduction of a market orientation. We will need to consider similar approaches within the educational enterprise. Many of the issues to be addressed by the educational reform task forces, therefore, concern the strategic use of state powers and authorities to introduce the best elements of a market orientation to the educational enterprise. Such an orientation is intended to empower the providers of service (teachers and administrators) to produce a better, more cost effective and responsive product, while, at the same time, empowering the consumers of educational services (parents, students and tax payers) to exercise greater choice in the educational product they buy.

With this framework in mind, seven gubernatorial task forces will be convened to explore options and develop strategies for state action related to:

- o parental involvement and choice,
- o school readiness,
- o good teaching and good teachers,
- o school leadership and management,
- o school facilities utilization,
- o advanced technology, and
- o college quality.

Recently attempted innovations within these seven aspects of the educational enterprise have shown promise as good targets for reform to affect the quality of educational services delivered. Six of the areas for reform deal with issues related to elementary and secondary education, and one deals with post-secondary education. All will need to focus on promoting greater flexibility and accountability in the delivery of educational services at all levels of educational governance.

Briefing papers providing background on the proposed scope of inquiry of each of the task forces follow at tabs 2 through 8 corresponding to the listing above. These papers include a discussion of current state practices, relevant research findings and the state policy issues to be addressed by each task force. A description of the proposed task force activities and timetable for the entire initiative may be found at tab 9.

EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY AND CHOICE

One of our democracy's fundamental principles is that adults are allowed to make decisions about their lives. People select their occupation, attorney, doctor and church. Citizens are not told which grocery stores, gas stations, churches or various professional services they must use because of where they live. Affluent families have always had the opportunity to select among various schools for their children. Some parents send their children to independent or church-related schools. Others send their children to public schools in exclusive suburbs. However, in most places, children - particularly from low to moderate income families - are assigned to elementary and secondary schools according to geographic boundaries within political jurisdictions.

All too often maps have been the focus of the debates regarding equity and access. Recently, however, some communities have discovered that providing choices among public schools can produce many benefits. States and school districts providing more choices find that choice and equity are not in conflict; permitting choices among certain kinds of schools is one important way to provide truly equal educational opportunity. Authorities have learned that students who are not successful in one setting do extremely well in another program. In some areas in the country, families are permitted to select from among various schools, with tax funds following their decision (much like an "Education G.I. Bill for families"). In many of these communities, permitting families to select from among various schools has brought together students of different racial and economic backgrounds in a

positive setting. Research shows that when families are permitted to select from among various schools, parental satisfaction and participation in schools increases, student performance and behavior improves and educators feel more like professionals. Equally important, permitting choice among schools can encourage schools to become somewhat distinctive. This can give school site administrators and teachers more authority and help them to build a cohesive school climate. It is this climate, produced by parents actively selecting a particular school, which some authorities believe helps make some schools more effective.

I. BACKGROUND

In recent years, considerable attention has focused on federal tuition tax credits and voucher plans. These proposals are promoted on the theory that they would help people attend private or parochial schools, with direct tax support (vouchers) or indirect support (tax deductions). Regardless of the merits or weaknesses of these federally focused initiatives, states, the preeminent level of government responsible for education, are, of necessity, seeking new options for old problems. Under existing state authority, a number of options exists for improving education by increasing parental and student choice within the public schools. These deserve further exploration. Already in many schools (especially secondary schools), parents are permitted to choose among different kinds of programs for their children. Some states are moving beyond this, so that families will be able to select from among different kinds of schools. These plans involve three general variables: students, type of school and scope of the plan.

Some plans focus on particular students. Colorado recently passed legislation permitting students who have not succeeded in traditional programs to cross district boundaries to attend special public school district programs established for youngsters like themselves. Minnesota has just adopted legislation involving up to 100 students in grades 9-12 who are gifted and not challenged in their present school. These students will be permitted to attend other public schools selected by the Minnesota Department of Education for their outstanding programs for gifted students, even though the school may be outside the student's district of residence. The State of Washington provides funds to privately operated educational clinics working with teenagers who have not succeeded in high school. Florida and Tennessee have provided funds to school districts to establish programs for students who have not succeeded in high schools.

Plans differ in the particular schools which are included. While much of the national discussion involves expanding choice among public and private schools, several governors have proposed that students have more opportunities to choose from among various public schools. South Dakota has just adopted legislation expanding opportunities for students attending high schools with fewer than 45 students. These students will be able to attend larger high schools in neighboring districts. Since the 1890s, Vermont has given considerable flexibility to its towns. A town may establish its own secondary school, cooperate with other towns in creating a "union district," or permit students to attend the public or state approved private non-sectarian school

of their choice. Today, approximately 1/3 of Vermont's 246 towns permit the third option.

The scope of state plans to expand opportunity varies. Massachusetts, Missouri and Wisconsin provide funds permitting students to move across district lines to increase integration (e.g., Boston, St. Louis, Milwaukee, and their respective suburbs). Massachusetts also has a major state program encouraging integration within districts by creating a series of magnet programs. Minnesota has just passed legislation permitting 11th and 12th graders throughout the state to attend post-secondary institutions part- or full-time, with tax funds following the students.

II. RELEVANT RESEARCH

A number of studies indicate that expanding families' educational choices can have a significant positive impact. While recognizing that the details of a plan to increase educational choice are important, several authorities report gains from well-developed, carefully monitored programs.

Hofstra University's Mary Ann Raywid, a strong opponent of providing funds to private and parochial schools at any level of government, has reviewed more than 100 studies examining the impact of expanding choice among public schools. She concluded that:

a) when allowed to select from among various programs, parents are much more satisfied and often more involved in their children's education. Community members who did not have children in school also speak more highly of districts in which choices are available;

b) students benefit in a number of ways by having options. Behavior, attendance, self-concept and attitudes toward learning and school improve as students are allowed to attend different kinds of programs. In many cases, academic gains were noted as well; and

c) teachers and administrators said they felt more like professionals when allowed to create distinctive programs from which families could select. Many reported putting much more energy and enthusiasm into their work.

Massachusetts' Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity has had almost a decade of experience with this issue. The bureau's chief describes himself as a convert to the idea of using choice to increase equity. Dr. Charles Glenn found that the vast majority of parents of all income levels actively participated in programs to select public schools for their children. He has become convinced that:

> ...choice can do much to promote equity...by creating conditions which encourage schools to become more effective...by allowing schools to specialize and thus to meet the needs of some students very well rather than all students at a level of minimum adequacy, and by increasing the influence of parents over the education of their children in a way which is largely conflict-free...The availability of expanded choice can increase the likelihood that some educational setting will be available to meet the needs of every child.

Washington's Legislative Budget Committee examined the educational clinics program and concluded that "on the basis of costs, outcomes and educational gains, the clinics make a good showing."

National Gallup Polls determined that a majority of those questioned would like to have choices among various schools. The percentages among Blacks and

those ages 18-29 favoring greater educational choice were even higher than those of the overall population.

These various limited experiments have only begun to suggest answers to all of the questions one might pose on this subject. Additional research will be needed to find answers on such topics as:

a. Are the positive impacts of expanding choice distributed equally in poor and affluent communities? In rural and urban areas?

b. What are the negative aspects of expanding choice? On students? On parents?

c. What happens to faculty in schools which lose significant numbers of students under programs of choice?

d. What methods to provide information to parents about different programs have been found to be most useful?

e. Are there ways that intra- and inter-state cooperation can be used to expand educational choice and opportunity?

III. POLICY ISSUES FOR TASK FORCE CONSIDERATION

1. If states opt for a more flexible "choice system," how can a balance be struck that accommodates the needs for accountability while promoting flexibility?

2. What guidelines can states use so that expanding educational choice:

   a. Enhances racial and suburban/urban integration of students?

   b. Improves opportunities in rural areas? Will expanding opportunity have much impact in areas which are thinly populated? Are there ways the state can encourage districts to cooperate to increase opportunities in such areas?

c. Encourages schools to work with young people who have not succeeded in other programs?

d. Helps equalize funding formulae for students?

e. Helps improve the transition between secondary and post-secondary education?

f. Does not have a negative impact on extra-curricular activities such as athletics, debate and music?

3. What is the state's role in matters such as:

a. Helping to develop parental skill and interest in selecting among various schools?

b. Helping school districts plan, administer and finance the system, recognizing attendance patterns could shift radically?

c. Establishing guidelines governing selection procedures public schools will be permitted to adopt? What will be the impact of having some publicly supported programs with higher standards for teachers and students?

d. Adjusting funding formulas among school districts?

e. Establishing guidelines for advertising programs?

f. Funding transportation costs?

4. What are the Constitutional implications of expanding choice among various schools?

IMPROVING YOUNG PEOPLES' READINESS FOR SCHOOL

A number of states are considering steps to increase the skills and knowledge of 3 to 5 year olds, so that they will be more successful in elementary and secondary school. Numerous studies report differences in school achievement among students from different income levels. Students from affluent families almost always perform better than those from low income backgrounds. Increasing attention is being focused on what families do with, to and for their children prior to entering elementary schools. Researchers point out that some students enter elementary school, for example, able to write their names, speak clearly, share toys with other children, use scissors and read at least a few words, while other children can do none of these things.

Several states are trying to increase the number of young people who have such skills by establishing early childhood education programs, especially for children from low income families. These states hope to increase the schools' success rate by helping young people develop skills they will need in elementary school. Moreover, these states recognize that an increasing number of middle and low income families are providing formal pre-school educational experiences for their children.

High quality programs for preschool children involve both supervision and skill development. There is an enormous range of programs for these children. Some are intended primarily to watch over children while their parent(s) work or attend school; the best programs help youngsters develop skills, knowledge and attitudes that will increase their chances for success

in school. Some programs last throughout the day while others last only a few hours during the day.

A number of studies have identified benefits to both participants and society from high quality early childhood education programs. Investigators are finding that young people from low income families who attend a well-run early childhood development program perform better in school and in later life than those who do not.

For about twenty years the federal government has provided funds for early childhood education via the Head Start program. However, recent surveys indicate that Head Start reaches less than a quarter of poor 3 and 4 year olds. Many Head Start programs report long waiting lists.

Part of the reason for waiting lists is that the number and percentage of children under age 6 living in low income families is increasing. The number of children under age 10 living in single-parent families is expected to rise by 48 percent between 1980 and 1990, from 6 million to 8.6 million. These families typically suffer from a greater incidence of poverty. And even if poverty rates declined to 1979 (pre-recession) levels, the number of children under six in poverty would increase by 1 million during the 1980s, from 3.9 million in 1980 to 4.9 million in 1990 (25 percent increase).

If action is not taken to make high quality programs available to children whose parents cannot afford it, the achievement gap between low and upper income students may increase. Equally important, states all too often have to pay costs for teenage pregnancy, welfare and crime which could have been reduced through more timely investment in early education.

I. BACKGROUND

Current State Practices: States have adopted several approaches in working with preschool age children and their families. The first involves funding early-childhood programs for children from low income families. Texas and South Carolina recently initiated such programs through their public school systems. Some states, such as Alaska, substantially exceed the required match of federal dollars for Head Start, thereby expanding opportunities available under this program. Another approach is to fund and require attendance in kindergarten. Several states require that all students attend kindergarten. Some states are now considering funding all-day kindergarten programs for at least some of their children. A third approach recently taken by Missouri and Minnesota has been to create district and social service agency operated training programs for parents of preschoolers.

To help children with special needs or handicaps a number of states have funded early diagnosis/screening programs to identify preschool children who physically or intellectually are not developing normally. Several states support school districts or social service agencies for early childhood program aided at meeting these children's needs.

II. RELEVANT RESEARCH

The number of children participating in formal preschool education programs is increasing. Between 1970 and 1983, the number of 3 year olds in preschool programs increased from 13 percent to 28 percent . The number of 4 year olds in such programs increased from 28 percent to 49 percent in the same

time period. However, there is a significant gap in enrollment based on family income. As of 1980 (the latest year for which figures are available), 52 percent of the 3 and 4 year olds from families earnings more than $20,000 were enrolled in preschool programs, compared to 29 percent of those from families earning less than $20,000.

Most research on the impact of providing formal early childhood education programs has supported its value. An early study of the federally funded "Head Start" program for young people from low income families showed that by the time they finished 6th grade, there was little discernable difference between those who did and those who did not participate. However, more recent research shows that programs with certain characteristics can make a dramatic difference. These programs included several components thought to be vital: a clear, consistent curriculum; frequent parent involvement, including in-home meetings with parents; a program director and teaching staff who have received formal training in working with young children; a purposeful in-service training program and feedback provided by frequent program evaluation. Some, but not all, Head Start programs include some or all of these features.

While these characteristics add to the initial cost of a program, they also help make it cost-effective over the long run. One recent study has compared students who attended high quality programs with those who did not, ten to fifteen years after the programs occurred. The results are dramatic. Participants in high quality programs showed consistent academic and social benefits. Academic advantages acquired by the group attending preschool programs included higher IQ's; better achievement on reading, mathematics and language tests; spending more time on homework; fewer referrals to special

education programs and reduced dropout rates. Social advantages for the youngsters attending preschool programs include lower rates of disruption in school, fewer instances of delinquency in the community, increased rates of employment at age 19, and lower rates of teenage pregnancy and reduced reliance on welfare at age 19.

Research on early diagnosis of handicapped youngsters shows that such programs can have a significant positive effect. Identifying and beginning treatment early has in many cases reduced the severity of childrens' disability and made programming more effective.

Some advocates of early childhood programs point to the long-run economic advantages of these programs. One estimate suggests that investments in such programs can have a 200 to 300 percent return, factoring in reduced costs for special education, non-promotion of students and increased lifetime earnings for participants. Additional savings from early childhood programs might be calculated in terms of reduced rates of teenage pregnancy, welfare and crime which could be achieved through greater investments in early education.

There are a variety of federal and state funding streams supporting the preschool-age child, including the use of the tax codes for child care credits. Approximately one billion dollars annually supports preschool educational activities through direct support to community-based Head Start programs. Day care support flows through the states, predominately through Title XX and other smaller programs; the total amount through these funding streams is estimated at one billion dollars also.

Some authorities insist that certain kinds of early education programs are not appropriate for all children. They suggest that it is important to recognize varying maturation rates; some children should wait a year prior to entering kindergarten (i.e. starting at age 6, rather than age 5). Many of these investigators warn that pushing too hard on academic skills at age 3, 4 or 5 may discourage comparatively immature young children and inhibit their future growth and development.

The task force will have the benefit of additional information regarding research in the early fall when the federal government plans to release a compilation of findings from over 80 studies of Head Start.

In addition to this important research base, the task force may want to gather practical experience and information on the following questions:

A. What statewide standards have been established for day care and early childhood education programs which receive state funding?

B. What content or curriculum standards for early childhood education programs have or should be mandated by a state?

C. What qualifications and/or certification have been required of those who work in state-supported early childhood education programs? Are they different than those working in a day care program? Should they be?

D. What other standards should perspective early childhood staff members have to meet?

E. What continuing education requirements have been established for staff of early childhood programs?

F. What standards have been established for the buildings in which early childhood programs are housed?

G. How have states helped families select from among day care and early childhood programs?

H. What forms of parental involvement/education have states encouraged or mandated as part of early childhood education programs?

I. What form of continuing review, licensure or accreditation should states establish or require for programs receiving their support?

J. Are there different licensing standards between day care and early childhood education programs? Do the licensing standards affect program quality?

K. What additional research has been done regarding the impact on later student achievement of kindergarten attendance? Should states target certain ages, income levels and/or disabled children for these programs?

L. What has been the cost/benefit ratio of early childhood screening programs?

M. What are the costs/benefits of establishing programs for preschool children of different ages?

III. **POLICY ISSUES FOR TASK FORCE CONSIDERATION:**

1. If states choose to invest in early childhood education programs, what priorities should be established?

2. How can states encourage development of programs which include the best features of early childhood education and day care programs?

3. What is the state's role in maintaining standards for early childhood programs? Should certain standards be set locally, while others are established by professionals and still others by the state?

4. What can states do to work with corporations to encourage their support of high quality early childhood development programs?

5. Should states provide choices in geographical areas to permit families a selection among various programs that recognize the maturation needs of the child?

6. How can states best respond to those who need both supervision, i.e. day care, and education for their preschool age children?

ATTRACTING AND RETAINING TALENTED TEACHERS

Virtually every state is considering ways to attract and retain creative, effective teachers. This area is viewed as one of the most crucial to improving American education.

Most experts agree that the student-teacher relationship is the most crucial one in education. Central to the American dream has been the notion that hardworking, talented young people will gain the skills in school they need to be successful in later life. However, a high quality education depends on the people providing instruction. It follows that school districts want to attract and retain the best teachers.

For many years education benefited from limited opportunities that were available to bright women and minorities. Education was one of the few professions open to them. This is no longer true. Recent studies indicate that those entering the teaching profession represent the bottom of their college classes. Those leaving teaching, either to enter administration or to leave education entirely, represent some of the most talented teachers.

Competition from industry for bright young people has intensified. Teachers' starting pay is below what most other college graduates receive, and the gap grows between teaching and most private sector professionals as time goes on. In many states, teacher salaries are being increased. However, a 1984 survey found that 40 states reported shortages of teachers in areas such as mathematics, science and world languages. States and local districts are

searching for additional strategies to attract and retain talented teachers. Policy-makers are also exploring ways to help educators increase skills and knowledge throughout their careers.

I. BACKGROUND

Current State Practices: State and local policy-makers have taken a number of steps to work on these problems.

The first kind of activity involves changing entrance requirements for teachers. Many states are considering policies which specify skills and knowledge teachers must have prior to entering classrooms. A number of states have decided to require that prospective teachers will have to pass tests prior to being given certification by the Department of Education. These tests involve some combination of general knowledge as well as information specific to their field of instruction.

At least one state, Arkansas, is testing both prospective and present teachers to determine their skills. Teachers already in the profession who do not pass the test will have opportunities to improve their skills and take the test again. If unsuccessful a second time, they will lose their teaching certificates.

Testing is also being used to help established alternative routes to teaching. Traditionally, public school teachers had to receive degrees in education from colleges or universities, while in many states, private and parochial school teachers have not been required to earn such degrees. New

Jersey, Massachusetts and California permit people who have academic degrees to enter teaching under certain circumstances.

The second kind of activity involves changing the nature of the teaching profession. Several states have developed plans to provide additional responsibilities, a longer working year and higher pay for outstanding teachers. Tennessee and Florida have the most inclusive statewide programs. Other states such as California and Massachusetts have developed mentor-teacher projects. While each state's program is somewhat different (and the details are important), they generally share certain goals:

1. encouraging effective teachers to stay in the classroom,
2. attracting people into education with the possibility of greater rewards, and
3. using outstanding teacher's skills to assist new and mid-career instructors.

More than thirty states have created pilot career ladder programs or have established task forces to examine the concept. Several states are experimenting with joint appointments involving corporations and school districts. In Massachusetts, Digital Equipment Company hires people half time and during the summer as part of a plan to encourage bright college students to consider teaching for at least a few years. In several states, IBM. hires a few teachers half time during the school year and full time for a summer to encourage talented teachers to stay in the classroom.

Minnesota is experimenting with another approach to change the teaching profession. Groups of teachers are allowed to establish "group practices"

which then contract with school districts for educational services. These group practices are something like legal or medical partnerships and will provide new incentives and opportunities for classroom teachers.

Creating new financial incentives is another approach some states are taking to increase the attractiveness of the teaching profession. Approximately twenty states are forgiving a portion of a college loan for students with high test scores and/or grade point averages who spend some time in teaching.

Most states are increasing teachers' salaries through various strategies. Some states are putting the bulk of money toward raising beginning salaries, while others are focusing on the salaries of teachers who have been in the profession for some time. In some states, such decisions are left to local school boards.

Relevant research: Most of the strategies described above have been adopted within the last several years. It is too soon to reach more than tentative conclusions about the impact of these initiatives. However, some conclusions are justified at this point.

1. There will be an increasing need to attract new people into teaching in the next decade. A 1984 survey found that forty states report a shortage of teachers in some fields (especially mathematics and science). The same survey found that thirty states are projecting shortages five years from now at the secondary level, compared with 23 states reporting projected shortages of teachers at the elementary school level. A number of teachers in other fields who entered teaching shorty after World War II are close to retirement. Meanwhile, there will be modest increases in the number of students attending school in most parts of the country. Thus, many states will be facing sizable shortages of teachers within the next five years.

2. Testing prospective and presently-employed teachers will change the racial mix of those eligible to be hired, at least in the short-run. A number of states which started using tests in the last few years learned that a much higher percentage of White applicants will pass the test than will Blacks, Hispanics, or Native Americans. Based on this experience, some states have taken steps to improve preparation for these tests since they value a multi-cultural pool of prospective teachers.

3. The impact of alternative routes to teaching is mixed. It is too early to tell what the impact will be on students. At least two programs appear to be successful in attracting people who have a college degree, but not in education. A Massachusetts program now in its third year has drawn several hundred prospective math and science teachers. These students represent the top 10-15 percent of their college classes. Almost 1000 people applied for certification under New Jersey's new program in its first year of operation. However, less than fifty people applied for California's new alternative certification program during its first year. So the evidence is mixed.

4. Loans and scholarships to attract people to teaching may have more impact on which area a person teaches in, rather than whether the person enters teaching. Both the Federal government and about a dozen states have used this strategy for many years. Generally there have been plenty of applicants for the loans and scholarships; but it is not clear that people who otherwise would not have entered the profession did so because of the grants. Targeting the grant or loan provisions to a specific field (i.e. mathematics, science, special education) or to geographic criteria (i.e. rural areas) through grant or loan provisions appears, for some, to be a useful and influential supply side tool.

5. People who are now teachers are much more dissatisfied with the profession than their counterparts were twenty years ago. In a 1981 study, 55% of teachers said they certainly or probably would not go into the profession again. Twenty years ago only 11% of the teachers had these attitudes. Teachers reported public attitudes toward education and treatment of education by the media as the two variables contributing most to job dissatisfaction. Salary ranked fourth.

6. Making teacher salaries more competitive with other private-sector professions will require considerable reallocation or additions to funding for education. Educators have never been paid as much as most other professionals who are required to have a college degree. However, in the decades of the 40's, 50's and 60's, teaching salaries moved closer to other salaries. During the 70's,

the gap widened significantly. During the period 1972-73 to 1982-83, per-capita income in real (1972) dollars increased 6.5%. Nationally, teachers salaries declined in real (1972) dollars 12.2% during the same period. Equally important, the gap between teachers' salaries and other professionals increases, the longer a person works. Thus, the entering salary difference between a beginning teacher and attorney might be $10-15,000. After fifteen years, the yearly difference could be $45-60,000. These differences could cause policy-makers to focus more attention on mid and later career salaries.

Based on the experience to date, it is fair to observe that several technical issues in career ladder and mentor teacher programs must be resolved if the programs are to be workable. Experience suggests that states or local boards must:

a. develop clear, reliable, valid, consistent methods to evaluate teachers who apply for advanced positions.

b. establish specific, meaningful responsibilities for "career" or "mentor" teachers.

c. decide how much direction states will give to local districts - how much autonomy local districts will have to establish their own programs; and

d. determine whether participants receive extra funds for outstanding performance, extended hours or contract year, or for additional duties.

Failure to resolve these issues will produce considerable conflict and antagonism.

Additional information on available research or new research is needed on these topics:

1. What has been learned about career ladder programs?

   a. What are the best methods to select teachers?

b. What has been the experience of permitting local districts to modify programs?

c. What factors encourage teachers to apply?

d. What factors discourage teachers from applying?

e. Are there certain components of career ladder programs which make them more or less acceptable to teachers' organizations?

f. What are the most appropriate responsibilities for those given additional status?

g. What happens to teachers who are not selected?

h. What has been the experience when one set of teachers have greater responsibilities to evaluate other teachers?

2. What is known about programs providing alternative routes to teaching?

   a. How do states determine whether a person who has not completed a teacher-education program is qualified to teach?

   b. Assuming alternative routes are viable mechanisms to help solve the supply and demand problem, what can states do to encourage highly skilled people to apply for alternative routes to education?

   c. Should states mandate or encourage any special evaluation or monitoring of people who use non-traditional routes to teaching?

3. What has been the impact of using different kinds of financial incentives to attract and retain people in the teaching profession?

4. In which teaching fields are widespread shortages likely to occur in the next five years?

5. Can loan programs be designed to attract talented people who would otherwise not enter the profession to enter education, particularly for fields of specialization in high demand?

6. Is there data showing that the competency of teachers has improved with the increase of teachers' salaries?

7. Is there data showing how much teachers' salaries would have to be increased in order to attract students with significantly higher test scores?

8. Is there any correlation between scores on tests teachers are required to take in some states prior to being certified and subsequent performance in a classroom?

III. **POLICY ISSUES FOR TASK FORCE CONSIDERATION**

1. How can states establish career ladder programs which improve the quality of instruction provided to students?

2. What are the critical components of a state policy on alternative routes to teaching which attract highly skilled people?

3. What are the best ways to target funds to retain talented teachers in the classroom?

4. How might states experiment with teacher-partnership programs?

5. What kind of public-private partnerships can states establish to improve teacher quality?

   a. Can states encourage joint corporate-school district appointments?

   b. Can states encourage corporate sponsorship of teachers?

ENCOURAGING RESULTS-ORIENTED LEADERSHIP

Both research and common sense suggest that the quality of an institution's leadership will have a dramatic impact on its performance. Administrators and managers must occupy key roles in improving schools. They help set the school's climate, develop priorities, encourage or discourage cooperation and allocate resources. Educational researchers agree that administrators occupy a central role in advancing or inhibiting school reform. As states consider ways to improve their schools, many of them are devoting attention to the pre- and in-service training, selection and incentives for district level leadership.

Before states decide how to train and encourage results-oriented administrators, they must be clear about the results they seek. One obvious result is an increase in student achievement test scores. Other results which have been suggested include superintendent's ranking, community satisfaction indexes, staff attendance and turnover. It is necessary to recognize that the most effective leaders will do more than manage. As one nationally recognized authority on effective school leadership noted:

> Effective principals move a school toward a vision of what could be rather than maintaining what is. We do not extol the virtues of great leaders whose prime achievement has been maintaining the status quo...If educational policymakers are serious about supporting effective principals, they must be prepared for principals who may be 'boat rockers,' not satisfied to keep a low profile and maintain the status quo.

I. BACKGROUND

Current state practices: Until the last few years, most states had relatively small roles in the training, selection and provision of incentives for educational leaders. State involvement generally was limited to establishing standards for entering administrators (i.e. a degree in educational administration). However, over the last five years this pattern has been altered and states have focused attention and resources on improvement strategies.

Principal Assessment Centers: Since World War II, the majority of large corporations have used the assessment center approach to help analyze the potential of entrance-level managers and others for promotion. During the last few years, policymakers have become intrigued with the idea of applying this concept to educational administration. Thirty states throughout the nation have established programs to help assess skills, attitudes and knowledge of prospective administrators. The number of states with principal assessment centers doubled between 1983 and 1985. The National Association of Secondary School Principals has taken a leading role in developing the procedures and practices of these assessment centers. The centers have used research on effective principals to evaluate candidates in twelve areas: problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, stress tolerance, oral communication, written communication, range of interests, personal motivation and educational values. Candidates generally spend several days at the assessment center, participating in various exercises.

Principal assessment centers are housed in different places: state departments of education, colleges and universities, school districts and intermediate units. States vary regarding principal assessment centers. In South Carolina, all individuals aspiring to become principals must go through the several-day assessment process. In addition to using their own selection criteria for selecting principals, South Carolina school districts must review reports from the assessment center on each candidate before making a decision. Unlike South Carolina, other states with assessment centers make information available to individuals and school districts, but do not mandate the use of the information. Some districts in these other states do, however, require all applicants to go through the assessment center.

Several states are now using their assessment centers for prospective superintendents and vocational administrators in addition to building principals.

Principal academies: These programs provide in-service training to prinicipals and other administrators. Many of these projects run in conjunction with principal assessment centers to provide training in the practical fields and skills which school administrators find they need and are sometimes unable to obtain at other institutions. In Florida, the legislature adopted a comprehensive approach to improving administrator skills by creating the Florida Council on Educational Management. Part of the Council's mission involves working with the Florida Academy for School Leaders. The Florida Council also trains people who will conduct workshops, works with post-secondary institutions and provides grants to local school districts for management development training.

Certification: A number of states are adopting competency-based certification programs for administrators. Florida has developed a list of competencies which is part of its certification program. Prospective administrators must now pass a written examination prior to receiving administrative certification. Florida administrators may move through three levels, with advancement dependent on a superior performance rating in a district or Department of Education approved appraisal system. Several states require that principals take part in professional development programs in order to maintain certification. Failure to complete enough professional activities results in loss of certification.

Incentive Programs: Several kinds of programs are being discussed or are in the early stages of implementation. In the first, principals who are judged unusually effective will receive public recognition and increased pay. South Carolina's and Tennessee's recent educational reform package included provisions for paying outstanding principals more money. South Carolina has developed criteria by which to judge outstanding principals. It is now developing standards and instruments to measure its principals. Tennessee's career ladder program includes opportunities for principals to work a longer year and receive more money. Some authorities believe that "school-based incentives may be as powerful as personal recognition." These researchers suggest that outstanding principals receive additional funds to use in their schools, be provided with greater discretion in the management of buildings and be permitted to participate in other training and professional development activities.

Relevant research: Within the last five years, a number of studies by scholars such as John Goodlad and Ron Edmonds identified the building administrator as a key participant in efforts to improve education. Research on reform efforts and on "effective schools" agree that the principal's attitude and skills have a major impact on what happens, for good or ill, inside the school. Major state activities to train, select and encourage results-oriented school leadership are relatively recent. According to a major review of the research done by Michael Fullan, "Historically and by-and-large currently, principals are not selected on the basis of their skills as instructional improvement leaders." Michael Cohen, Director of the State Education Policy Consortium reports that "selection, instead, tends to depend heavily on somewhat vague judgments about how well a candidate 'fits' the style and culture of the district. New principals often have little idea of why they are selected and thus arrive on the job with no clear mandate." Research about the impact of innovations is just becoming available.

The major findings about programs described above involve investigations of the principal assessment centers. Investigators compared assessment center ratings of individuals with subsequent ratings given by supervisors, teachers, support staff and student ratings of school climate. Administrators who were rated highly by assessment centers subsequently were rated highly by their supervisors. Moreover, students attending schools with administrators rated highly by assessment centers tended to have better attitudes toward the program's learning climate. Teacher and support staff ratings were not as highly related to assessment center ratings.

The task force may want find out if research is underway or if a sufficient practical knowledge base exists to answer the following question:

a. What changes in the role or responsibilities of building administrators would increase their ability to improve educational outcomes?

b. What should be the relationship between career/mentor/master teachers and administrators? What are the policy implications for the new responsibilities which are being created for teachers?

c. How could states work together with state and local school districts to measure the effectiveness of administrators? Establish incentives for administrators? What kinds of incentives could states provide to administrators? Encourage public-private partnerships which would improve educational leadership?

d. What is the appropriate relationship between continuing education efforts and principal academies? What other kinds of administrative in-service programs have been found to be effective?

e. How can states cooperate to improve training, continuing education, evaluation and incentives for educational leaders?

f. How do outstanding teachers view the role of administrators? What should administrators do to encourage and assist the finest teachers?

g. What has been the impact of establishing school-based incentives, as opposed to incentives for individuals?

II. POLICY ISSUES FOR TASK FORCE CONSIDERATION

1. What is the appropriate relationship between the state and local school districts in selecting and rewarding administrators? Should states help establish measurement criteria or create evaluation instruments?

2. Should states establish alternative routes into administrative positions? Should states support exchange programs between public and private sector administrators or otherwise make it easier for successful private sector managers to become school administrators?

3. Should states require certain kinds of continuing education for continuing administrative certification?

4. Should states establish new incentives for building administrators?

5. How should differences among elementary and secondary schools be reflected in the state programs for training, certification, evaluation, continuing education and incentives for school principals?

MAKING MORE EFFICIENT USE OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS

During the last twenty years, many states and communities have invested heavily in school buildings and equipment. Towns have tried to express their commitment to youth, education and the future by providing attractive buildings with extensive facilities. However, increasing attention has focused on what happens in school buildings during the evening and summer. In some communities, the schools sit empty and are un- or under-used during these periods.

Another concern of policymakers has been what to do with school buildings as enrollments decline and energy costs increase. Many communities have closed schools and cut teachers, though these are two of the least popular actions a school board can take. Some communities are looking for new ways to avoid these actions.

Some communities are reevaluating the use of school buildings and equipment to make more effective use of available resources. School officials in urban areas are starting to think about school buildings, as those in many rural areas have traditionally done, as true community centers. Rural communities, on the other hand, are often faced with the loss of the school, and thus their community center, and therefore must find ways to not lose this important base.

Developing evening, summer and even year-round educational programs can produce a better return for tax payers on their investment in school buildings

and equipment. Using schools as a shared facility involving educational as well as social programs can be an alternative to closing schools and cutting teachers. Leasing vacant space generates additional revenue for school districts, while permitting districts to share costs of heat, light, security and maintenance.

I. BACKGROUND

Current State Practices: It is recognized that the determination of the use of school facilities has been the primary domain of local boards of education, but states have influenced these decisions in a variety of ways. Several states have passed legislation encouraging, rather than mandating, extended use of school buildings. These laws focus on who may use space in school buildings, what space can be used, procedures for its use and removing financial constraints on the use of revenue generated.

- Who May Use Space? Some legislatures have limited space rental to a few groups. A California law expanded school district authority so that authorities could lease space to "other school districts, education agencies, governmental units, non-profit organizations, community agencies, professional agencies, commercial and non-commercial firms, corporations, partnerships, business and individuals." Colorado state law permits leasing space to "any persons, partnerships, associations, or corporations, whether public or private."

- For What Can Space Be Used? Some legislators have broadened definitions of acceptable space utilization. Connecticut legislators agreed to allow boards of education to lease vacant space to day care centers, after finding that existing law prohibited such practices. New York legislation permits shared use among school districts, residential housing and companies. Several New York City schools share space with a corporate office in which students serve as interns.

California legislators removed prohibitions against shared occupancy of schools by social service agencies. Authorities in several states have asked for, and obtained, legislation permitting the establishment of day care and early-childhood programs inside elementary or secondary schools.

- Removing Financial Disincentives: The Educational Facilities Laboratory notes that financial constraints on revenue from leasing vacant space can "influence community uses by erecting or lowering economic barriers." One issue involves whether a school district may profit from leased space. In some states, school districts may not make a profit. In other states districts must charge at least "fair market value." Another question involves the use of revenues. Minnesota recently changed its law so that school districts were allowed to place lease revenues in operating funds, rather than retiring bonds on other buildings in the district. One issue which has not been resolved involves property tax liabilities. Laws vary on whether school districts must pay property taxes on space they lease. Such taxation can be a dramatic disincentive to leasing space.

A number of states provide funds so that school districts can establish summer and evening programs to serve the students and community. These summer programs involve both enrichment and remedial opportunities. Some states permit school districts to establish after-school programs for children whose parents work.

Some communities have established year-round school programs which employ teachers for 11 or 12 months. Students attend the same number of days as in more conventional programs, but generally have shorter vacations than the traditional three months in the summer.

II. RELEVANT RESEARCH

The year-round and summer school programs address research showing that many students forget a significant portion of what they have learned over the traditional three month summer break. Investigators found that summer programs had a dramatic impact on learning for some handicapped students. And investigators found that families liked having an option to select between a traditional nine month or an innovative 12 month program.

Other investigators found that sharing facilities helped school districts deal with urgent problems: dramatically increased fuel costs and decreased numbers of citizens with direct ties to schools. A 1983 survey by the American Association of School Administrators found that more than 60 percent of the nation's urban school districts planned to lay off teachers and other personnel in order to pay for heating bills. Districts found that their natural gas heating bills had increased by about 73 percent in just two years. Districts were looking for ways to deal with these expanding costs.

The Educational Facilities Laboratory in New York found that a number of school districts report increased community support when they established cooperative programs in their school buildings. Senior citizens and other community members who did not have children in school saw the schools as resource centers serving their immediate needs. Cooperative or shared

programs have sometimes been used as part of magnet school projects. In parts of Massachusetts where this has been attempted, the response has been excellent.

Sometimes school districts have established programs which permit parents to leave children early and pick them up late at a day care program operated within the school building. School districts report these are some of the most popular magnet programs they can offer.

Additional research will be needed for the task force to complete its work. Some of the topics requiring more information include:

a. What effects do year-round schools have on student and teacher performance?

b. Are capital costs a major or increasing drain on school budgets?

c. Is it feasible to charge enough for space use so that the costs of utilities and wear and tear do not offset the additional revenues from increased use?

d. Have states and school districts had experiences which convinced them that there are some groups or activities with which it is not easy or appropriate to share facilities?

e. What negative consequences of increased use of school facilities should state initiatives take into account?

f. How are states encouraging full-time use of vocational school equipment and facilities?

III. POLICY ISSUES FOR TASK FORCE CONSIDERATION

1. What statewide incentives could be created to encourage greater cooperation and use of school facilities and equipment, particularly for the more costly vocational training facilities?

2. What statewide obstacles could be reduced to encourage greater use of school facilities and equipment?

3. What guidelines should be developed for implementation of joint use/shared facilities?

4. Do state funding formulas encourage new construction rather than rehabilitation of buildings?

MAKING EFFECTIVE EDUCATIONAL USE OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY

Many states are considering how their schools can use emerging technology. They recognize that advanced technologies helped make industry more productive and hope that schools will be able to increase skill and knowledge levels by appropriate, cost effective use of equipment. Employing advanced technology means understanding a number of technologies, not just computers.

Policymakers are examining potential uses of technology in education with a mixture of interest and caution. Over the last hundred years, machines have had a dramatic impact on our society. Machines altered work and recreation. But they have had relatively little impact on the way education is organized.

During the last fifty years, a number of machines have been touted as having dramatic potential to improve education: radio, television, overhead and movie projectors, teaching machines, language labs, etc. Millions of dollars were spent to buy this equipment, but none achieved the breakthroughs which were envisioned.

While technology had relatively little impact on schools, it was changing the nature of work. Technological advances have eliminated some jobs and altered others. Some authorities believe that many of the most desirable jobs in the next century will require an ability to use sophisticated equipment. But the kind of technological knowledge that will be required is unclear and uncertain.

Schools are now rushing to buy computers and other kinds of advanced technology (e.g., videotape machines, cable television). Between 1981 and 1984, the number of computers in schools increased from fewer than 30,000 to more than 630,000. However, the National School Boards Association found in a 1984 survey that while virtually all public school districts were using computers for instructional purposes, only one in seven had developed policies on purchasing software. They had not decided how schools were going to use the computers they purchased.

Some states are establishing course and competency requirements at a time when authorities are deeply divided about the nature of technology-related skills all students should possess. Some experts have questioned whether there is such a thing as computer literacy, while others disagree about the skills which make a person computer literate.

Introducing some of the latest technology into schools has brought new challenges and questions. Some schools lack trained faculty and have stored computers and other equipment on shelves. In some states, serious equity problems have developed with affluent male suburban students having much greater access to advanced technology do than other students. Some districts are uncertain about what instructional material should accompany the new equipment. Authorities agree that millions of dollars can be wasted unless educational technology policies are carefully crafted and frequently reevaluated. To make the best use of these dollars, staff must be adequately trained to implement the policies.

I. MODELS

States are using a variety of strategies to test educational applications of emerging technologies. Overall, states are experimenting with technology to accomplish at least four goals:

a. Broaden educational opportunities for students in remote areas. States are using computers, television and other equipment to provide instruction in subject areas for students attending small schools miles from other schools.

b. Manage the enterprise more efficiently: administrators are using computers to help schedule students, keep records, pay bills, notify parents when students are absent, etc.

c. Improve instruction for most students: computers and other technologies are being used to provide direct instruction to individuals and groups of students. They are also being used to reduce the time teachers spend on paperwork (i.e. creating instructional materials, grading tests and figuring grades) so that they will be able to spend more time working directly with students.

d. Develop students' understanding of machines to prepare them for careers in an advanced technological society.

States are using the following strategies to accomplish these goals:

1. Adopting mandates: states are experimenting with requirements involving what courses students must take, what skills prospective high school graduates and new teachers must have, what school districts must offer and what statewide controls there will be. About ten states are requiring that students at a certain age or grade level take a class which will help them use computers. Several other states require that students have computer literacy skills prior to graduation. One state says that students must be "exposed to information technology" prior to graduation. A few states are requiring that all prospective teachers have certain computer-related skills before applying for certification.

2. Developing centralized state-developed information systems: several states are creating programs which will reach all schools. Alaska has created a vast interactive educational television network to reach its pupils. Maryland is developing a telecommunications system which may provide

instruction for each school in the state. On the management side of the equation, several other states are creating electronic bulletin-boards enabling people to communicate via computers and phone lines.

3. Creating, purchasing and evaluating instructional materials: Some states have provided funds to organizations which then develop instructional materials. Several states have created an approved software list. School districts receive funds which they may use to help pay for instructional materials if they are on the list. Other states, such as California, Indiana and New York, are establishing technology centers around the state where educators can review instructional materials and read publications which evaluate those materials. These states are not creating approved technology instructional material lists. (Although California is creating a list of criteria which school districts may use to evaluate materials.) A number of states are providing funds to school districts to help them purchase computer hardware and instructional materials.

4. Planning: Minnesota encourages each school district to create its own plan to use technology. The districts must include certain components in the plan. After this plan is submitted and approved by the State Department of Education, school districts receive funds for training and instructional materials.

5. Pilot programs: A number of states are funding programs in a few districts to experiment with different approaches. Some of these programs focus on a particular kind of technology, such as computers, cable television or videodiscs. Others seek to integrate some of the machines.

II. RELEVANT RESEARCH

There is a growing amount of research on the use of advanced technology in schools. As in many other areas, experts disagree. However, there are some tentative conclusions. These include:

a. Planning needs to be improved at all levels of the systems to assure wise utilization. Individual teachers report frustration because some districts and building administrators have decided how and where the technology will be used with little opportunity for teachers to make recommendations.

b. Equity Issues need to be addressed: As of 1985, affluent, metropolitan area students generally have considerably more access to most educational technology than do low income and rural students. Equally important, there are different patterns of use among various groups. Low income students tend to use the least sophisticated educational computing programs, while affluent students use more complicated applications. There are also differences among males'and females' use of computers.

c. Cost Effectiveness of various machines and their uses need to be considered: a number of studies show that computers have a positive impact on reading and mathematics skills of students who did not succeed in school. One new study concludes that using a number of specific programs helps elementary students develop better analytic and problem-solving skills. A number of studies show students are enthusiastic about computers. Using computers to improve students' writing skills appears to increase students' willingness to make more revisions and write longer essays. But research indicates that using computers may not be as cost-effective in some situations as it is in others. For example, computer-assisted instruction may be more useful for remedial work than initial instruction. Using older students under the supervision of a certified teacher to tutor younger students seems to be considerably more cost-effective with elementary-age students in reading and mathematics classes.

d. Staffing and Training Considerations: Several studies show that many of the most outstanding teachers are recruited away from schools - into administrative positions, universities or private industry. Moreover, many college students knowledgeable about technology who consider a career in education are receiving offers from private industry which appear far more attractive. A number of authorities warn that action must be taken to attract and retain these people.

Educational historians agree that part of the reason other technologies had little impact in schools was that teachers did not receive much training in how to use them. Highly effective training programs must be created if educational technology is to have much impact. In some areas, companies producing equipment and software are providing training (generally using their own machines). Many educators believe that the most appropriate and valuable training is provided by educators with classroom experience who have no vested interest in a particular machine. Some of the most successful training programs involve school district-university cooperation, with courses taught by outstanding classroom teachers who have been made adjunct university staff.

e. Computer Literacy: This may be a term in search of a definition. Experts are deeply divided on the value and content of "computer literacy" courses. Some authorities recommend that schools use computers and other equipment in many courses, rather than make heavy commitments to a computer literacy approach. Other researchers argue for some kind of introduction for all students. Authorities also disagree about the age at which that introduction to technology is most appropriate. Some people favor teaching all students to "program" computers, while others recommend exposing students to various applications of computers.

The task force may want to identify available research findings that address the following questions:

a. What are the most cost-effective ways to use various technological advances to:

   i. Improve educational opportunities for children with particular emphasis for those in remote areas;

   ii. Increase administrators' effectiveness;

   iii. Increase learning for most students?

b. What are the implications for state policies of the rapid pace of technological innovation? How should this affect state policies on:

   i. Purchase of equipment and instructional materials;

   ii. Instruction;

   iii. Training programs for prospective teachers and administrators?

c. What kinds of cooperation with vendors have states found to be most useful?

d. What evidence is available about the value of training programs established by different groups?

e. What is known about the effectiveness of instruction delivered via television, radio, videotape or computer compared to that directly delivered by teachers in classrooms? What have states done to maintain quality control for high school or college students who seek credit for such courses?

f. What kinds of technology-related skills will be required of most workers in the twenty-first century?

III. POLICY ISSUES FOR TASK FORCE CONSIDERATION

1. How can states encourage attention to, and use of, other technologies in addition to computers? How can states encourage coordinated, rather than isolated, use of technology?

2. What planning should states require of each district using advanced technology? What incentives and assistance should states provide for planning programs?

3. What kind of course and competency mandates do states wish to adopt (for students, prospective and presently employed teachers)?

4. What technologically-related training opportunities for administrators and teachers do states wish to establish? What kinds of monitoring should be done? What, if any, controls should be put on training programs established by corporations producing various technologies?

5. What steps could a state take to increase equal educational technology opportunities for students? Should states target assistance to specific regions, such as rural or low income urban areas?

6. What are appropriate roles for states to produce and evaluating instructional materials for advanced technology?

7. What public-private partnerships in educational technology could states encourage?

8. What are the implications for state policies on vocational education of jobs being created and threatened by technological advances?

9. What arrangements can states develop to retain skills of outstanding faculty members who are being offered jobs outside schools and often outside education?

10. What arrangements should states make to provide credit for and assess the quality of learning gained via various technologies?

COLLEGE QUALITY

While recent public attention has been focused predominately on reform of elementary and secondary education, significant changes in the higher education environment are creating a need for a review of what appropriate measures of quality in higher education should be.

Changing demographics and shifting consumer needs have created a growing continuing education and training market. In addition, the number of youth who have served as the traditional source of college enrollments is declining, thereby altering the characteristics of the college campus. Lower achievement levels among prospective college students are a reality as are static and possibly declining revenues from tuition and public support. This context is pushing many institutions to review their missions, functions, marketing and offerings. Higher education institutions cannot complete this reappraisal in isolation. State government has a critical role to play.

State government, as the primary provider of public institutional support and the unit of government responsible for protecting the education consumer, has an obligation to take the leadership role in the review and development of appropriate measures of college quality. States must do this to assure prudent use of tax dollars and to better inform the public about how successfully institutions of higher education are performing.

I. BACKGROUND

By clarifying the roles and missions of each type of institution, Tennessee, New York, Massachusetts, Michigan and Florida have made major strides in reordering the priorities for quality higher education delivery. Michigan, for example, has mapped out specific program roles, degree levels and regional access responsibilities.

In 1980-81, the Tennessee Higher Education Board modified its funding policies to provide incentives for improved management and student performance. The Performance Funding Program rewards institutions for demonstrated performance on five measures of quality. One early outcome has been higher admission standards by all universities.

The use of incentives has taken various forms in other states. For example, the New Jersey Department of Higher Education distributes additional funding to the state's colleges through competitive grant programs focused on such things as student-based high school/college articulation efforts and in-service training created by colleges.

The Ohio Board of Regents has proposed a major policy change in state funding for higher education built upon the combination of a strong base budget and a series of five interrelated challenge grant programs entitled SELECTIVE EXCELLENCE. These programs are designed to challenge the state's public colleges and universities to make strategic choices, bringing their strongest programs of instruction and research to national prominence.

Some public-supported institutions are considering reestablishment of policies that require all students to take placement tests in basic learning skills upon entry so that remediation can be prescribed to prevent future failure. Georgia is one of several states that now require progress testing upon completion of the sophomore year with access to remediation if necessary.

Currently, the quality and quantity of consumer information available varies widely. Washington, Missouri, Colorado and Michigan are states which have undertaken initiatives to improve the recruitment and marketing practices of all publicly supported institutions to insure that students and their parents are better able to make informed choices in a timely fashion.

II. RELEVANT RESEARCH

Much of the recent literature can perhaps be categorized as needs identification and articulation of the problems. For example, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) has urged the states to support both tougher standards for admission and for student performance. They argue that establishment of better measures of student performance not only at entry, but also during and before exit from college has the potential of improving education at all levels, since college entrance requirements determine the rigor of the high school curriculum, as well as the curricula of graduate programs. The reintroduction of comprehensive examinations for seniors has added rigor to the programs of some institutions. The SREB report observes that while "these requirements will not produce excellence, they do provide a foundation upon which institutions can build to establish higher standards for excellence."

The National Commission on Higher Education Issues, under the chairmanship of Robben Flemming, has challenged higher education to restore public confidence in the value of the undergraduate degree so as to insure that colleges and universities produce graduates who are knowledgeable, articulate and competent with a well-rounded yet thorough education.

Others with a similar concern about the value of the degree have focused recommendations on four-year institutions by urging them to consider adoption of standardized core curricula. The 1984 American Council on Education CAMPUS TRENDS notes that 62 percent of the more than 1,000 institutions that it samples now requires some form of core coursework. Among institutions that have developed successful models are Northeastern Illinois University and the University of West Florida.

Others, such as UCLA's Alexander Austin in **Degrees with Integrity**, have argued for a "value added" approach that focuses on the learning gains of students in addition to the outcomes attained. Value added emphasizes use of existing resources to enhance student performance. It does not take for granted the student's capacity to learn, but seeks to evaluate student learning and personal development through a sophisticated system of regular assessment procedures. Value added, as practiced at Northeast State University in Missouri, establishes a new set of institutional priorities and practices whereby a student's learning is measured against what he or she learns rather than against the performance of other students. In addition, the student is regularly given an opportunity for feedback concerning his or her progress from faculty and administrators who are deeply concerned about the student's progress.

The New England Board of Higher Education's **A THREAT TO EXCELLENCE** urges all colleges and universities to initiate new policies leading to "quality reviews" of both their instructional programs and student support services. The report suggests that by utilizing a strategy developed in New York that convenes a council of educators from outside the institution, an unbiased assessment of the quality of performance can be made with the goals of reducing or eliminating weak programs.

John Rouche of the University of Texas urges major reform of the management style of institutions so that they are able to delineate instructional performance in terms of accountability. One reform model purposed by the **INVOLVEMENT IN LEARNING** study group funded by the National Institute of Education, urges institutions to reallocate highly skilled senior faculty to teaching first-and second-year classes. Front loading, as it is called, proposes to expose freshmen and sophomores to greater intellectual challenges early in their academic careers. The report observes that colleges undertaking this approach need to support it with commitment to providing mini-sabbaticals for course preparation and innovation. Additionally, faculty tenure evaluations would have to be altered to emphasize classroom performance above research and published works.

Several researchers argue that renewal of institutional commitment to quality undergraduate education will also require review of current policies and practices for selecting, orienting and evaluating both full-time and part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants to insure that students have access to a stable body of well-trained instructors and advisers.

Studies by the College Board and the American College Testing Service urge institutional policy planners to develop a systematic program of career and personal guidance that would be available to all undergraduates from matriculation through graduation.

The above referenced literature, with limited exceptions, focuses its recommendations for improving the quality of higher education on the institutional level. This is not necessarily surprising nor inappropriate given the critical importance of the classroom. The task force, of necessity, will need to take a more holistic view in its deliberations.

The measures recommended generally take into account the capacity and performance of three of the actors involved in the educational process - namely students, faculty and institutions. Little has emerged that has recognized the roles and responsibilities of other actors involved in the publicly-funded higher education system, specifically state government and its taxpayers. As recommendations emerge regarding measures of quality and means of setting standards to gauge progress, it will be necessary to sort out which approaches should be applied at the state level to students, institutions and faculty and which ones most appropriately should be applied at another level within the governance structure of higher education. The tradition, in our country, of regional voluntary accrediting organizations being the standard setters will also need to be factored into the task force deliberations.

The task force may wish to determine if there is relevant research or sufficient practical knowledge in the following areas:

a. What state policies and practices are currently in use to measure the performance of management, faculty and students in colleges and universities, and how effective have these been in improving quality?

- o What are those measures?
- o Who is held accountable for implementation of those measures?
- o What influence have fiscal incentives had on implementation of these policies and practices?

b. Do current policies and practices that measure faculty and student performance accurately reflect community and student expectations?

- o Who has the responsibility for the collection of relevant information on community and student expectations?

c. What policies and practices are being altered, if any, by the regional accrediting organizations that will refine measurement of quality?

d. Are communities and students satisfied with the accuracy and usefulness of the consumer information provided to them regarding course offerings, quality of instruction and the success of those efforts?

- o Can the military's nationwide experience with a variety of public and private institutions provide any useful suggestions on how to provide consumer information?

III. POLICY ISSUES

1. If states choose to develop statewide measures to determine quality outcomes for students, faculty and institutions, what should they be?

2. Should such measures vary by type of institution in accordance with its mission? If so, how can weights be ascribed within the standards set by a state to accommodate these variances?

3. What, if any, interstate measures or indicators are desirable?

4. Should states continue to delegate the same powers as in the past to the regional accreditation organizations? Should there be more state oversight of these organizations?

THE GOVERNORS' ACTION PLAN FOR

ATTAINING EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

A. Planned Activities

Throughout the coming year, each of the task forces will carry out its mission by:

1) Holding hearings throughout the country to: a) identify what initiatives are underway and what seems to be working; and b) obtain advice on what other reforms should be considered and what role(s) states might play in promoting their implementation.

2) Commissioning in-depth policy analyses on key issues that emerge from the hearing process with a focus on development of options for state action. Some papers may address issues relevant to only one task force while others are likely to address crosscutting finance, governance and other questions which span the scope of inquiry of more than one task force.

3) Charting a five-year action plan for the states which:

   - identifies as yet unmet needs within the specified fields, additional options for reform to meet these needs, and emerging issues requiring further research, analysis and/or development;

   - identifies promising strategies, including state policy options, model legislation and management practices that states may wish to adopt to implement and/or promote desired reforms; and

   - provides a scorecard that each state can use for self-evaluation to measure yearly progress in achieving reforms to address state needs and priorities in the seven identified areas.

It is anticipated that every governor will participate as a member of one of the seven tasks forces. Each task force will be chaired by a governor with a high level of concern for the issues related to the targeted topic area. The first of at least three meetings of each task force will be hosted by the

chair's state during the early fall of 1985. Subsequent meetings and hearings will be held during the winter and spring of 1985-86 in regionally dispersed locations.

The written and oral testimony to be solicited for review and deliberation by each task force is intended to build awareness of the issues to be addressed, current practices and research, and alternative solutions. Following these hearings, each task force will continue its work, drawing implications for state and national policy planning between 1986 and 1991, and making recommendations for implementation of additional reforms, as appropriate. Task force reports will serve as the basis for broader discussion of these issues by all governors at the NGA annual winter meeting to be held in Washington, D.C. in February, 1986. The summary, "Governors Report on US Education, 1991," will be completed for discussion and action at the NGA Annual Meeting to be held in July, 1986, in South Carolina. Upon approval by the governors, the report will be widely disseminated to the key decisionmakers at the federal, state and local levels to encourage rapid implementation of desirable reforms.

B. TIMETABLE

SUMMER - FALL 1985

- Identify Chairs and membership for seven task forces.
- Appoint consultant/coordinator and identify topical experts.
- Assign staff support.

SEPTEMBER 1985 - JANUARY 1986

- Identify presentors for task force hearings.
- Conduct task force meetings and hearings.
- Commission first round of critical issue papers.
- Summarize initial findings.

During Winter Meeting in Washington, D.C.:

- Conduct special sessions for all members to highlight progress to date and to review interim reports of individual task forces.

MARCH - JUNE 1986

- Commission additional papers as necessary.

- o Task forces prepare their findings for inclusion in final reports on future directions for reform in K-12 and post-secondary public education.

- o Editorial Review completed.

SUMMER 1986

- o Publish Task Force Reports and final summary, Governors' Report on US Education, 1991.

- o Highlight "Governors' Report" at summer meeting of NGA at Hilton Head, S.C.

  - It is the intent that at this meeting, NGA will conduct one full session on K-12 issues and one full session on higher education reform. These sessions will include keynote speakers and reports by task force chairs.

- o Disseminate Task Force reports to federal, state and local policymakers.

- o Provide technical assistance to state policymakers.